

1 Mark S. O'Connor (#011029)  
2 BEUS GILBERT MCGRODER PLLC  
3 701 North 44<sup>th</sup> St.  
4 Phoenix, AZ 85008  
5 Telephone: (480) 429-3000  
6 moconnor@beusgilbert.com

7 Ramon Rossi Lopez (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
8 (CA Bar No. 86361)  
9 LOPEZ MCHUGH LLP  
10 100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600  
11 Newport Beach, CA 92660  
12 rlopez@lopezmchugh.com

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

14 James R. Condo (#005867)  
15 Kristine L. Gallardo (#033975)  
16 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.  
17 One Arizona Center  
18 400 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900  
19 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2204  
20 Telephone: (602) 382-6000  
21 jcondo@swlaw.com  
22 kgallardo@swlaw.com

23 Richard B. North, Jr. (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
24 Georgia Bar No. 545599  
25 Matthew B. Lerner (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
26 Georgia Bar No. 446986  
27 NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP  
28 Atlantic Station  
201 17th Street, NW, Suite 1700  
Atlanta, GA 30363  
Telephone: (404) 322-6000  
richard.north@nelsonmullins.com  
matthew.lerner@nelsonmullins.com

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
*C. R. Bard, Inc. and*  
*Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

IN RE: Bard IVC Filters Products  
Liability Litigation

No. 2:15-MD-02641-DGC

**JOINT PROPOSED REPORT FOR  
PURPOSES OF TRANSFER OF  
CERTAIN CASES**

(Assigned to the Honorable David G.  
Campbell)

1 Pursuant to Case Management Order No. 47, the parties submit the following joint  
2 proposed report to be sent to districts receiving transfers under § 1404(a) for all cases in  
3 this MDL that are in Track 2 that are ready for remand or transfer. *See* Doc. 21540 at 5-6.

4 This multidistrict litigation proceeding (“MDL”) involves personal injury cases  
5 brought against Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.  
6 (collectively, “Bard”). Bard manufactures and markets medical devices, including inferior  
7 vena cava (“IVC”) filters. The MDL Plaintiffs have received implants of Bard IVC filters  
8 and claim they are defective and have caused Plaintiffs to suffer serious injury or death.

9 The MDL was transferred to this Court in August 2015 when 22 cases had been filed.  
10 Doc. 1. More than 8,000 cases had been filed when the MDL closed on May 31, 2019. Docs.  
11 18079, 18128. Thousands of cases pending in the MDL have settled or are near settlement.  
12 *See* Docs. 16343, 19445, 19798, 21167, 21410. The remaining cases no longer benefit from  
13 centralized proceedings.

14 On August 20, 2019, the Court suggested the remand of 35 cases that were  
15 transferred to this MDL by the United States Judicial Panel for Multidistrict Litigation (the  
16 “Panel”), and transferred more than 500 cases that were directly filed in the MDL to  
17 appropriate districts. Doc. 19899 at 2-6, 34-59. The Court suggested the remand of another  
18 case and transferred nearly 400 cases on October 17, 2019. Doc. 20672 at 2-4, 32-48. On  
19 March 4, 2020, the Court suggested the remand of 30 cases and transferred more than 1,000  
20 cases. Doc. 21462 at 2-4, 33-74 (as amended by Docs. 21463, 21472). On September 10,  
21 2010, the Court transferred more than 100 cases. Doc. 21589 at 2, 31-35.

22 In an updated report on the settlement status of cases, the parties identify more than  
23 650 pending cases for which no appropriate stipulated dismissal had been filed by  
24 November 2, 2020.<sup>1</sup> Doc. 21726 at 1, 3; 21726-1; 21726-4. These cases – which were  
25 directly filed in the MDL – will be transferred to appropriate districts pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> Case Management Order (“CMO”) 42 provides that all Track 2 cases for which no  
28 stipulated dismissal has been filed by May 1, 2020, will be recommended to the Panel for  
remand or will be transferred under § 1404(a). Doc. 16343 at 7. The May 1 deadline was  
extended to November 2, 2020. Doc. 21518.

§ 1404(a). The cases to be transferred are listed on Schedule A to this order. One other case – *Tami Sheets v. C. R. Bard, Inc.*, No. 2:16-cv-01088 – will be unconsolidated from the MDL, will remain in the District of Arizona, and will be assigned to the undersigned judge.

To assist the transferee courts, this order will describe events that have taken place in the MDL. A copy of this order, along with the case files and materials, will be available to courts after transfer.

#### **I. Transfer Under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).**

Pursuant to Case Management Order No. 4 (“CMO 4”), cases were filed directly in the MDL through use of a short form complaint. Doc. 363 at 3 (as amended by Docs. 1108, 1485). Plaintiffs were required to identify in the short form complaint the district where venue would be proper absent direct filing in the MDL. *See id.* at 7. CMO 4 provides that, upon the MDL’s closure, each pending direct-filed case shall be transferred to the district identified in the short form complaint. *Id.* at 3.

Section 1404(a) provides that “[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented.” Pursuant to § 1404(a), the Court will transfer the cases listed on Schedule A to the districts identified in the short form complaints. *See In re Biomet M2a Magnum Hip Implant Prods. Liab. Litig.*, No. 3:12-MD-2391, 2018 WL 7683307, at \*1 (N.D. Ind. Sept. 6, 2018) (transferring cases under § 1404(a) where they would “no longer benefit from centralized proceedings[] and the remaining case-specific issues are best left to decision by the courts that will try the cases”). Defendants’ right to challenge venue and personal jurisdiction upon transfer is preserved. *See* Docs. 19899 at 4-6, 20672 at 4, 21426 at 4.

#### **II. The MDL Proceedings.**

A summary of the MDL proceedings is provided below to assist courts receiving transfers under § 1404(a). CMOs, discovery orders, and other significant rulings are listed in Exhibit 1. The status of the remaining case-specific discovery and other pretrial issues in individual cases should be addressed by the transferee courts.

**A. Plaintiffs' Claims and the Pleadings.**

The IVC is a large vein that returns blood to the heart from the lower body. An IVC filter is a small device implanted in the IVC to catch blood clots before they reach the heart and lungs. This MDL involves multiple versions of Bard's retrievable IVC filters – the Recovery, G2, G2X, Eclipse, Meridian, and Denali. These filters are umbrella-shaped devices that have multiple limbs fanning out from a cone-shaped head. The limbs consist of legs with hooks that attach to the IVC wall and curved arms to catch or break up blood clots. Each of these filters is a variation of its predecessor.<sup>2</sup>

The MDL Plaintiffs allege that Bard filters are more dangerous than other IVC filters because they have higher risks of tilting, perforating the IVC, or fracturing and migrating to vital organs. Plaintiffs further allege that Bard failed to warn patients and physicians about these higher risks. Defendants dispute these allegations, contending that Bard filters are safe and effective, that their complication rates are low and comparable to those of other IVC filters, and that the medical community is aware of the risks associated with IVC filters.

CMO 2, entered October 30, 2015, required the creation of a master complaint, a master answer, and templates of short-form complaints and answers. Doc. 249 at 6. The master complaint and answer were filed December 12, 2015. Docs. 364, 366. They are the operative pleadings for most of the cases in this MDL.

The master complaint gives notice, pursuant to Rule 8, of the allegations that Plaintiffs assert generally. The master complaint contains seventeen state law claims: manufacturing defect (Counts I and V); failure to warn (Counts II and VII); design defect (Counts III and IV); failure to recall (Count VI); misrepresentation (Counts VIII and XII); negligence per se (Count IX); breach of warranty (Counts X and XI); concealment (Count XIII); consumer fraud and deceptive trade practices (Count XIV); loss of consortium (Count

---

<sup>2</sup> In early 2019, Defendants moved to expand the scope of the MDL to include cases concerning Bard's Simon Nitinol Filter ("SNF"), a permanent device that predated the other filters in this litigation. The Panel denied the motion as moot because more than 80 SNF cases already had been filed in the MDL. None of the SNF cases are subject to this order.

1 XV); and wrongful death and survival (Counts XVI and XVII). Doc. 364 at 34-63. Plaintiffs  
2 seek both compensatory and punitive damages. *Id.* at 63.

3 Plaintiff-specific allegations are contained in individual short-form complaints or  
4 certain complaints served on Defendants before the filing of the master complaint. *See* Docs.  
5 249, 363, 365. Plaintiffs also provided Defendants with profile forms and fact sheets that  
6 describe their individual claims and conditions. *See* Doc. 365.

#### 7 **B. Case Management Orders.**

8 The primary orders governing pretrial management of this MDL are a series of  
9 CMOs, along with certain amendments. To date, the Court has issued 47 CMOs. These  
10 orders are discussed below and can be found on this District's website at  
11 <http://www.azd.uscourts.gov/case-info/bard>.

#### 12 **C. Lead Counsel.**

13 CMO 1, entered October 30, 2015, appointed Co-Lead/Liaison Counsel for Plaintiffs  
14 ("Lead Counsel") to manage the litigation on behalf of Plaintiffs, and set out the  
15 responsibilities of Lead Counsel. Doc. 248. Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel has changed since the  
16 inception of the MDL. Mr. Ramon Lopez, of Lopez McHugh, LLP, in Newport Beach,  
17 California, and Mr. Mark O'Connor, of Beus Gilbert McGroder PLLC, in Phoenix, Arizona,  
18 are now Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs. Doc. 5285. Mr. Richard North of Nelson Mullins Riley  
19 & Scarborough, LLP, in Atlanta, Georgia, is Defendants' Lead Counsel.

#### 20 **D. Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and Common Benefits Fund.**

21 CMO 1 directed the selection and appointment of a Plaintiffs' Steering Committee  
22 ("PSC") to assist in the coordination of pretrial activities and trial planning. Plaintiffs' Lead  
23 Counsel and the PSC together form the Plaintiffs' Leadership Counsel ("PLC"). The PLC  
24 assists all Plaintiffs in the MDL by overseeing discovery, appearing in court, attending  
25 status conferences, and preparing motions and responses regarding case-wide discovery  
26 matters. CMO 1 has been amended to select and appoint a Plaintiffs' Executive Committee  
27 ("PEC") to assist Lead Counsel in the administration, organization, and strategic decisions  
28

1 of the PLC. Doc. 4016. The configuration of the PSC has changed during the course of the  
2 litigation. *See* Docs. 248, 4016, 5285.

3 CMO 6, entered December 18, 2015, set forth rules, policies, procedures, and  
4 guidelines for fees and expenses incurred by attorneys acting for the common benefit of all  
5 MDL Plaintiffs. Doc. 372. In May 2019, the Court increased the common benefit attorneys’  
6 fees assessment from 6% to 8%, but declined to increase the 3% assessment for costs. Doc.  
7 18038.

8 Upon transfer, individual Plaintiffs likely will be represented by their own counsel –  
9 the attorney or attorneys who filed their original complaint. Plaintiffs’ Lead Counsel, the  
10 PSC, the PLC, and the PEC were tasked with managing the MDL for Plaintiffs, not the  
11 individual cases upon transfer.

#### 12 **E. Status Conferences.**

13 Since the inception of the MDL, the Court has held regular status conferences with  
14 Lead Counsel for the parties to discuss issues related to the litigation. The initial case  
15 management conference was held in October 2015. Doc. 246. Deadlines were set for,  
16 among other things, the filing of master and short-form pleadings, profile forms, a proposed  
17 protective order (including Rule 502 provisions), a proposed protocol governing the  
18 production of electronically stored information (“ESI”), as well as deadlines to complete  
19 first-phase MDL discovery and address privilege log issues. Doc. 249. Thereafter, the Court  
20 held periodic status conferences to ensure that the parties were on task and to address routine  
21 discovery issues and disputes. In addition to the status conferences, the Court conducted  
22 telephone hearings to address time-sensitive issues, as well as numerous additional  
23 conferences to consider various matters such as dispositive motions and general case  
24 management issues.

#### 25 **F. Discovery.**

##### 26 **1. General Fact Discovery.**

27 Prior to the establishment of this MDL, Plaintiffs’ counsel had conducted substantial  
28 discovery against Bard concerning all aspects of Bard IVC filters, including the design,

1 testing, manufacturing, marketing, labeling, and post-market surveillance of the devices.  
2 Bard produced numerous documents and ESI and responded to thousands of written  
3 discovery requests, and more than 80 corporate witness depositions were taken. The pre-  
4 MDL fact discovery was made available by Bard to all Plaintiffs in the MDL.

5 CMO 8 established a procedure concerning re-deposing witnesses in the MDL. Doc.  
6 519. CMO 14 established deposition protocols generally. Doc. 2239. The Court allowed  
7 additional depositions of a handful of corporate witnesses that had been previously deposed,  
8 as well as numerous depositions of other Bard corporate witnesses, including several Rule  
9 30(b)(6) depositions. Docs. 3685, 4311. CMO 9 governed the production of ESI and hard-  
10 copy documents. Doc. 1259.

11 Discovery in the MDL was separated into phases. The parties completed the first  
12 phase of MDL discovery in early 2016. Doc. 519. The first phase included production of  
13 documents related to an FDA inspection and warning letter to Bard, an updated production  
14 of complaint and adverse event files, and an updated version of Bard's complaint database  
15 relating to IVC filters. Doc. 249. Plaintiffs also conducted a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition  
16 concerning the FDA inspection and warning letter, and a deposition of corporate witness  
17 Kay Fuller.

18 The parties completed the second phase of fact discovery in February 2017. CMO 8  
19 set deadlines for the second phase, which included all common fact and expert issues in the  
20 MDL, but not case-specific issues to be resolved after remand or transfer. Docs. 249, 519.  
21 Second-phase discovery included extensive additional discovery related to Bard's system  
22 architecture for ESI, Bard's ESI collection efforts, ESI relating to Bard's IVC filters, and  
23 Bard's national and regional sales and marketing practices. Plaintiffs also deposed two  
24 corporate witnesses in connection with Kay Fuller's allegations that a submission to the  
25 FDA regarding the Recovery filter did not bear her original signature. Doc. 1319 (CMO 10).  
26 Plaintiffs deposed additional corporate witnesses concerning the FDA inspections and  
27 warning letter. *Id.*



1 Bard also produced discovery regarding the sales and marketing materials related to  
2 the SNF, documents comparing filter performance and failure rates to the SNF, and internal  
3 and regulatory communications relating to the SNF. Docs. 1319, 10489. The Court denied  
4 Plaintiffs' request to obtain ESI discovery from Bard's overseas operations. Doc. 3398. The  
5 Court also denied Defendants' request to discover communications between Plaintiffs'  
6 counsel and NBC news related to stories about the products at issue in this litigation, and  
7 third-party financing that may be in place with respect to MDL Plaintiffs. Docs. 3313, 3314.  
8 Plaintiffs were required to produce communications between Plaintiffs and the FDA related  
9 to the FDA warning letter, but the Court denied Defendants' request to depose Plaintiffs'  
10 counsel regarding these communications. Docs. 3312, 4339. Defendants also produced  
11 punitive damages discovery, and Plaintiffs conducted a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition related to  
12 Bard's net worth.

13 All common fact discovery has now been completed, including preservation  
14 depositions for certain witnesses who will not be traveling to testify live at the trials of  
15 transferred cases. *See* Docs. 16343, 19959, 21063. Thus, courts receiving these cases need  
16 not be concerned with facilitating general fact discovery on remand or transfer.

## 17 **2. Case-Specific Discovery.**

18 CMO 5 governed initial case-specific discovery and required the parties to exchange  
19 abbreviated profile forms. Doc. 365 (as amended by Doc. 927). Plaintiffs were required to  
20 provide Defendants with a Plaintiff profile form ("PPF") that described individual  
21 conditions and claims. *Id.* at 5-9. Upon receipt of a substantially complete PPF, Defendants  
22 were required to provide the individual Plaintiff with a Defendants' profile form ("DPF")  
23 that disclosed information and documents concerning Defendants' contacts and relationship  
24 with Plaintiff's physicians, tracking and reporting of Plaintiff's claims, and certain  
25 manufacturing related information for Plaintiff's filter. *Id.* at 12-14. Completed profile  
26 forms were considered interrogatory answers under Rule 33 or responses to requests for  
27 production under Rule 34, and were governed by the standards applicable to written  
28 discovery under Rules 26 through 37. *Id.* at 2-3. CMO 5 also set deadlines and procedures



1 for resolving any purported deficiencies with the parties' profile forms, and for dismissal of  
2 cases that did not provide substantially completed profile forms. *Id.* at 2.<sup>3</sup>

3 Further discovery was conducted in a group of 48 cases ("Group 1") selected for  
4 consideration in the bellwether trial process from the pool of cases filed and properly served  
5 on Defendants in the MDL as of April 1, 2016 ("Initial Plaintiff Pool"). Docs. 1662, 3214,  
6 4311 (CMOs 11, 15, 19). Plaintiffs in Group 1 were required to provide Defendants with a  
7 Plaintiff fact sheet ("PFS") that described their individual conditions and claims in greater  
8 detail, and provided detailed disclosures concerning their individual background, medical  
9 history, insurance, fact witnesses, prior claims, and relevant documents and records  
10 authorizations. Docs. 1153-1, 1662 at 3.

11 Upon receipt of a PFS, Defendants were required to provide the individual Plaintiff  
12 with a Defendants fact sheet ("DFS") that disclosed in greater detail information concerning  
13 Defendants' contacts and relationship with Plaintiff, Plaintiff's physicians, or anyone on  
14 behalf of Plaintiff, Defendants' tracking and reporting of Plaintiff's claims, sales and  
15 marketing information for the implanting facility, manufacturing information for Plaintiff's  
16 filter, and other relevant documents. Docs. 1153-2, 1662 at 3. Completed fact sheets were  
17 considered interrogatory answers under Rule 33 or responses to requests for production  
18 under Rule 34, and were governed by the standards applicable to written discovery under  
19 Rules 26 through 37. Doc. 1662 at 3. CMO 11 set deadlines and procedures for resolving  
20 any purported deficiencies with the parties' fact sheets. *Id.* at 2, 4-5. CMO 12 governed  
21 records discovery for Group 1. Doc. 1663. The parties agreed to use The Marker Group to  
22 collect medical, insurance, Medicare, Medicaid, prescription, Social Security, workers'  
23 compensation, and employment records for individual plaintiffs from third-parties  
24 designated as custodians for such records in the PFS. *Id.* at 1.

25  
26  
27 <sup>3</sup> The Court has dismissed certain cases where Plaintiffs failed to provide complete  
28 PPFs. *See* Docs. 19874, 20667, 21461, 21579.

1 From Group 1, twelve cases were selected for further consideration as bellwether  
2 cases (“Discovery Group 1”). Docs. 1662, 3685, 4311 (CMOs 11, 18, 19). CMO 20 set  
3 deadlines for preliminary case-specific discovery in that group. Doc. 4335. Pursuant to the  
4 protocols set in CMOs 14 and 21, the parties were permitted to depose each Plaintiff, his or  
5 her spouse or a significant family member, the implanting physician, an additional treating  
6 physician, and either a Bard sales representative or supervisor. Docs. 2239, 4866 at 1-2.  
7 From Discovery Group 1, six Plaintiffs were selected for potential bellwether trials and  
8 further case-specific discovery (“Bellwether Group 1”). Docs. 1662, 3685, 4311, 5770,  
9 11659 (CMOs 11, 18, 19, 23, and 34).

10 Except for the 48 cases in Group 1, the parties did not conduct case-specific fact  
11 discovery for the cases listed on Schedule A during the MDL proceedings, other than  
12 exchanging abbreviated profile forms. The Court concluded that any additional case-  
13 specific discovery in these cases should await their transfer. Thus, courts receiving these  
14 cases should set a schedule for the completion of case-specific discovery.

### 15 **3. Expert Discovery.**

16 CMO 8 governed expert disclosures and discovery. Doc. 519. The parties designated  
17 general experts in all MDL cases and case-specific experts in individual bellwether cases.  
18 General expert discovery closed July 14, 2017. Doc. 3685 (CMO 18). The parties did not  
19 conduct case-specific expert discovery for the cases listed on Schedule A during the MDL  
20 proceedings. The Court concluded that case-specific expert discovery in these cases should  
21 await their transfer. Thus, courts receiving these cases should set a schedule for the  
22 completion of case-specific expert discovery.

### 23 **4. Privileged Materials.**

24 CMO 2 required Defendants to produce privilege logs in compliance with the  
25 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Doc. 249. The parties were then required to engage in an  
26 informal privilege log meet and confer process to resolve any privilege disputes. Defendants  
27 produced several privilege logs identifying documents withheld pursuant to the attorney-  
28 client privilege, the work-product doctrine, and other privileges. The parties regularly met

1 and conferred regarding the privilege logs and engaged in negotiations regarding certain  
2 entries identified by Plaintiffs. As part of that meet and confer process, Defendants provided  
3 Plaintiffs with a small number of these identified items for inspection and, in some cases,  
4 withdrew certain claims of attorney-client privilege and produced the previously withheld  
5 items.

6 CMO 3 governed the non-waiver of any privilege or work-product protection in this  
7 MDL, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d), by Defendants' disclosure or  
8 production of documents on its privilege logs as part of the meet and confer process. Doc.  
9 314.

10 In late 2015, Plaintiffs challenged a substantial number of documents on Defendants'  
11 privilege log. The parties engaged in an extensive meet and confer process, and Defendants  
12 produced certain documents pursuant to the Rule 502(d) order. *See id.* Plaintiffs moved to  
13 compel production of 133 disputed documents. The Court granted the motion in part. Doc.  
14 2813. The parties identified several categories of disputed documents and provided sample  
15 documents for in camera review. The Court denied Plaintiffs' motion with respect to seven  
16 of eight categories of documents and found only one of the sample documents in one of the  
17 categories to contain unprivileged portions that should be produced. The Court found all  
18 other documents protected by the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine. The  
19 Court directed the parties to use this ruling as a guide to resolve remaining privilege disputes.

20 Since this ruling, there have been no further challenges to Defendants' privilege logs.  
21 Defendants continued to provide updated privilege logs throughout the discovery process,  
22 and the parties met and conferred to resolve privilege disputes. Privilege issues should not  
23 be a concern for courts that receive these cases.

#### 24 **5. Protective Order and Confidentiality.**

25 A stipulated protective order governing the designation, handling, use, and  
26 disclosure of confidential discovery materials was entered in November 2015. Doc. 269.  
27 CMO 7, entered January 5, 2016, governed redactions of material from additional adverse  
28

1 event reports, complaint files, and related documents in accordance with the Health  
2 Insurance Portability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) and under 21 C.F.R. § 20.63(f). Doc. 401.

3 In September 2016, to expedite production of ESI, the parties agreed to a primarily  
4 “no-eyes-on” document production as to relevancy while still performing a privilege review  
5 for this expedited ESI document production. CMO 17 (Doc. 3372) modified the protections  
6 and requirements in the stipulated protective order (Doc. 269) and CMO 7 (Doc. 401) for  
7 ESI produced pursuant to this process. CMO 17 was amended in November 2016. Doc.  
8 4015.

9 Defendants filed a motion to seal certain trial exhibits at the conclusion of the first  
10 bellwether trial. Doc. 11010. The Court denied this motion and Defendants’ subsequent  
11 motion for reconsideration. Docs. 11642, 11766, 12069. Defendants also filed a motion to  
12 enforce the protective order for the second and third bellwether trials collectively. Doc.  
13 13126. This motion was denied. Doc. 14446. A list of exhibits admitted at the bellwether  
14 trials (excluding case-specific medical records) and documents deemed no longer subject  
15 to the protective order are attached as Exhibit 2.

#### 16 **G. Bellwether Cases and Trials.**

17 Six Plaintiffs were selected for potential bellwether trials. Docs. 5770, 11659 (CMOs  
18 23, 34). The Court held three bellwether trials: *Booker*, No. 2:16-cv-00474, *Jones*, No. 2:16-  
19 cv-00782, and *Hyde*, No. 2:16-cv-00893. The Court granted summary judgment in one of  
20 the bellwether cases, *Kruse*, No. 2:15-cv-01634, and removed another from the bellwether  
21 trial schedule at the request of Plaintiffs, *Mulkey*, No. 2:16-cv-00853. Docs. 12202, 13329.  
22 The final bellwether case, *Tinlin*, No. 2:16-cv-00263, settled shortly before trial in May  
23 2019. The Court determined that further bellwether trials were not necessary. Docs. 12853,  
24 13329 (CMOs 38, 40).

#### 25 **1. *Booker*, No. 2:16-cv-00474.**

26 The first bellwether trial concerned Plaintiff Sherr-Una Booker and involved a Bard  
27 G2 filter. The filter had tilted, migrated, and fractured. Plaintiff required open heart surgery  
28 to remove the fractured limbs and repair heart damage caused by a percutaneous removal

1 attempt. Plaintiff withdrew her breach of warranty claims before Defendants moved for  
 2 summary judgment. The Court granted Defendants' motion for summary judgment on the  
 3 claims for manufacturing defects, failure to recall, misrepresentation, negligence per se, and  
 4 breach of warranty. Docs. 8873, 8874. The remaining claims for failure to warn, design  
 5 defect, and punitive damages were tried to a jury over a three-week period in March 2018.

6 The jury found for Plaintiff Booker on her negligent failure-to-warn claim, and in  
 7 favor of Defendants on the design defect and strict liability failure-to-warn claims. Doc.  
 8 10595. The jury returned a verdict of \$2 million in compensatory damages (of which \$1.6  
 9 million was attributed to Defendants after apportionment of fault) and \$2 million in punitive  
 10 damages. *Id.*; Doc. 10596. The Court denied Defendants' motions for judgment as a matter  
 11 of law and a new-trial. Docs. 10879, 11598.

12 Defendants appealed, arguing that the Court erred by denying summary judgment on  
 13 their preemption defense, that a failure-to-warn claim was unavailable, and that the award  
 14 of punitive damages was not supported by the evidence. *See* Docs. 11934, 11953. The Ninth  
 15 Circuit affirmed. *See In re Bard IVC Filters Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 969 F.3d 1067 (9th Cir.  
 16 2020). The Ninth Circuit denied Defendants' petition for panel rehearing and rehearing en  
 17 banc. *See* No. 18-16349, Doc. 84.<sup>4</sup>

## 18 **2. Jones, No. 2:16-cv-00782.**

19 The second bellwether trial concerned Plaintiff Doris Jones and involved a Bard  
 20 Eclipse filter. Plaintiffs withdrew the manufacturing defect, failure to recall, and breach of  
 21 warranty claims. The Court granted summary judgment on the misrepresentation,  
 22 negligence per se, and unfair trade practices claims. Doc. 10404. The remaining claims for  
 23 failure to warn, design defect, and punitive damages were tried to a jury over a three-week  
 24 period in May 2018. The jury returned a defense verdict. Doc. 11350. Plaintiff filed a  
 25 motion to contact the jurors, which was denied. Docs. 11663, 12068.

26 Plaintiff appealed the Court's rulings excluding cephalad migration death evidence.

27 <sup>4</sup> Plaintiff filed and later dismissed with prejudice a cross-appeal. Docs. 12070,  
 28 17916.

1 Docs. 12057, 12071. The Ninth Circuit affirmed those rulings. *See In re Bard IVC Filters*  
2 *Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 816 F. App'x 218, 219 (9th Cir. 2020). The Ninth Circuit denied  
3 Plaintiff's petition for rehearing en banc. *See* No. 18-16461, Doc. 54.

4 **3. Kruse, No. 2:15-cv-01634.**

5 Plaintiff Carol Kruse's case was set for trial in September 2018. The Court granted  
6 Defendants' summary judgment motion on statute of limitations grounds. Doc. 12202.

7 **4. Hyde, No. 2:16-cv-00893.**

8 The third bellwether trial concerned Plaintiff Lisa Hyde and involved either a Bard  
9 G2X or Eclipse filter (the exact model was in dispute). Ms. Hyde's case was moved to the  
10 September 2018 bellwether slot in lieu of Ms. Kruse's case. Doc. 11867. Plaintiffs withdrew  
11 their claims for manufacturing defect and breach of express warranty. The Court granted  
12 summary judgment on the claims for breach of implied warranty, failure to warn, failure to  
13 recall, misrepresentation, concealment, and fraud. Doc. 12007. The Court also entered  
14 judgment in favor of Defendants on the negligence per se claim after concluding that it was  
15 impliedly preempted under 21 U.S.C. § 337(a). Doc. 12589. The remaining claims for  
16 design defect, loss of consortium, and punitive damages were tried to a jury over three  
17 weeks in September 2018. After the close of Plaintiffs' evidence, the Court granted in part  
18 Defendants' motion for judgment as a matter of law with respect to future damages for any  
19 cardiac arrhythmia Ms. Hyde may experience, but denied the motion as to the remaining  
20 claims. Doc. 12805. The jury returned a defense verdict. Doc. 12891. Plaintiff has appealed.  
21 Docs. 13465, 13480.

22 **5. Mulkey, No. 2:16-cv-00853.**

23 Plaintiff Debra Mulkey's case involved an Eclipse filter and was set for trial in  
24 February 2019. Before trial, Plaintiffs asked the Court to remove the Mulkey case from the  
25 bellwether trial schedule because it was similar to the Jones and Hyde cases and would not  
26 provide meaningful information to the parties. Doc. 12990. The Court granted the motion.  
27 Doc. 13329.  
28

1                   **6.      *Tinlin*, No. 2:16-cv-00263.**

2           The final bellwether trial concerned Plaintiff Debra Tinlin and involved a Bard  
3 Recovery filter. Plaintiffs withdrew their claims for manufacturing defect, failure to recall,  
4 negligence per se, and breach of warranty. The Court granted summary judgment on the  
5 misrepresentation and deceptive trade practices claims. Doc. 17008. The remaining claims  
6 for failure to warn, design defect, concealment, loss of consortium, and punitive damages  
7 were scheduled for trial in May 2019, but the case settled.

8                   **H.      Key Legal and Evidentiary Rulings.**

9           The Court has made many rulings in this MDL that could affect the transferred cases.  
10 The Court provides the following summary of key legal and evidentiary rulings to assist the  
11 courts that receive these cases.

12                   **1.      Medical Monitoring Class Action Ruling.**

13           In May 2016, Plaintiffs' counsel filed a medical monitoring class action that was  
14 consolidated with the MDL. *See Barraza v. C. R. Bard, Inc.*, No. 2:16-cv-01374 (D. Ariz.  
15 May 5, 2015). The *Barraza* Plaintiffs moved for class certification for medical monitoring  
16 relief on behalf of themselves and classes of individuals who have been implanted with a  
17 Bard IVC filter, have not had that filter removed, and have not filed a claim or lawsuit for  
18 personal injury related to the filter. *Id.*, Doc. 54. The Court declined to certify the class. *Id.*,  
19 Doc. 95.

20           The class certification motion recognized that only 16 states permit claims for  
21 medical monitoring. The Court concluded that the classes could not be certified under Rule  
22 23(b)(3) because individual issues would predominate. *Id.* at 20-21. The Court further  
23 concluded that the class could not be certified under Rule 23(b)(2) because the medical  
24 monitoring relief primarily constituted monetary rather than injunctive relief, and the class  
25 claims were not sufficiently cohesive to permit binding class-wide relief. *Id.* at 21-32.  
26 Finally, the Court concluded that typicality under Rule 23(a)(3) had not been established.  
27 *Id.* at 32-34. The *Barazza* Plaintiffs dismissed their claims without prejudice. Docs. 106,  
28 107. No appeal has been filed.



## 2. Federal Preemption Ruling.

Defendants moved for summary judgment on the grounds that Plaintiffs' state law claims are expressly preempted by the Medical Device Amendments of 1976 ("MDA"), 21 U.S.C. § 360 et seq., and impliedly preempted by the MDA under the Supreme Court's conflict preemption principles. Doc. 5396. The Court denied the motion. Doc. 8872.

The MDA curtails state regulation of medical devices through a provision that preempts state requirements that differ from or add to federal requirements. 21 U.S.C. § 360k. The Bard IVC filters at issue in this litigation were cleared for market by the FDA through section "510k" review, which focuses primarily on equivalence rather than safety and effectiveness. *See* § 360c(f)(1)(A).

The Supreme Court in *Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr*, 518 U.S. 470 (1996), held that § 360k does not preempt state law claims directed at medical devices cleared through the 510(k) process because substantial equivalence review places no federal requirements on a device. *Id.* at 492-94. *Lohr* also noted that the "510(k) process is focused on *equivalence*, not safety." *Id.* at 493 (emphasis in original). Although the Safe Medical Devices Act of 1990 ("SMDA"), Pub. L. 101-629, injected safety and effectiveness considerations into 510(k) review, it did so only comparatively. The Court found that *Lohr* remains good law and that clearance of a product under 510(k) generally does not preempt state common law claims. Doc. 8872 at 12-14.

The Court further found that Defendants failed to show that the 510(k) reviews for Bard IVC filters imposed device-specific requirements as needed for preemption under § 360k. *Id.* at 14-20. Even if device-specific federal requirements could be ascertained, Defendants made no showing that any particular state law claim is expressly preempted by federal requirements. *Id.* at 21-22.

The Court concluded that Plaintiffs' state law claims are not impliedly preempted because Defendants failed to show that it is impossible to do under federal law what the state laws require. *Id.* at 22-24.

Defendants pursued their preemption arguments in the Booker appeal. *See* Docs.

1 11934, 11953. As noted, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the Court's preemption ruling. *See In*  
 2 *re Bard IVC Filters Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 969 F.3d 1067, 1070-76 (9th Cir. 2020).

### 3 **3. The Lehmann Report Privilege and Work Product Rulings.**

4 The Court granted Defendants' motion for a protective order to prevent Plaintiffs  
 5 from using a December 15, 2004 report of Dr. John Lehmann. Doc. 699. Dr. Lehmann  
 6 provided various consulting services to Bard at different times. Following Bard's receipt of  
 7 potential product liability claims involving the Recovery filter, Bard's legal department  
 8 retained Dr. Lehmann in November 2004 to provide an assessment of the risks associated  
 9 with the Recovery filter and the extent of Bard's legal exposure. Dr. Lehmann prepared a  
 10 written report of his findings at the request of the legal department and in anticipation of  
 11 litigation. The Court found the report to be protected from disclosure by the work product  
 12 doctrine. *Id.* at 4-12. The Court further found that Plaintiffs had not shown a substantial  
 13 need for the report or undue hardship if the report was not disclosed. *Id.* at 13-15. The Court  
 14 agreed with the parties that this ruling does not alter any prior rulings by transferor judges  
 15 in specific cases. *Id.* at 22.

### 16 **4. Daubert Rulings.**

17 The Court has ruled on *Daubert* motions directed at general experts, and refers the  
 18 transferee courts to the following orders:

<b><i>Daubert</i> Order</b>	<b>Doc. Nos.</b>
Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Thomas Kinney	9428, 10323
Plaintiffs' Experts Drs. Scott Resnick, Robert Vogelzang, Kush Desai, and Robert Lewandowski	9432
Plaintiffs' Experts Drs. David Kessler and Suzanne Parisian	9433

1	Plaintiffs' Experts Drs. Thomas Kinney, Anne Christine Roberts, and Sanjeeva Kalva	9434
2		
3	Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Mark Eisenberg	9770
4		
5	Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Derek Muehrcke	9771
6		
7	Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Darren Hurst	9772
8		
9	Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Rebecca Betensky	9773
10		
11	Defendants' Expert Dr. Clement Grassi	9991, 10230
12		
13	Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Robert McMeeking	10051, 16992
14		
15	Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Robert Ritchie	10052
16		
17	Plaintiffs' Experts Drs. David Garcia and Michael Streiff	10072
18		
19	Defendants' Expert Dr. Christopher Morris	10230, 10231, 17285

## 5. Motion in Limine Rulings.

### a. FDA Evidence (*Cisson Motion*).

In the Booker bellwether trial, Plaintiffs sought to exclude, under Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403, evidence of the FDA's 510(k) clearance of Bard IVC filters and the lack of FDA enforcement action against Bard. Doc. 9529. The Court denied the motion. Docs. 9881, 10323.

The Court found that under Georgia law, which applied in both the Booker and Jones bellwether cases, compliance with federal regulations may not render a manufacturer's design choice immune from liability, but evidence of Bard's compliance with the 510(k) process was nonetheless relevant to the design defect and punitive damages claims. Doc. 9881 at 3-4. The Court acknowledged concerns that FDA evidence might mislead the jury

1 or result in a mini-trial. *Id.* at 5-6 (citing *In re C.R. Bard, Inc., Pelvic Repair Sys. Prods.*  
 2 *Liab. Litig. (Cisson)*, No. 2:10-CV-01224, 2013 WL 3282926, at \*2 (S.D.W. Va. June 27,  
 3 2013)). But the Court concluded that such concerns could adequately be addressed by  
 4 efficient management of the evidence and adherence to the Court's time limits for trial, and,  
 5 if necessary, by a limiting instruction regarding the nature of the 510(k) process. *Id.* at 6-7.<sup>5</sup>

6 The Court noted that the absence of any evidence regarding the 510(k) process would  
 7 run the risk of confusing the jury, as many of the relevant events in this litigation occurred  
 8 in the context of the FDA's 510(k) review of the Bard filters and are best understood in that  
 9 context. Doc. 9881 at 7. Nor was the Court convinced that all FDA references could  
 10 adequately be removed from the evidence. *Id.*

11 The Court further concluded that it would not exclude evidence and arguments by  
 12 Defendants that the FDA took no enforcement action against Bard with respect to the G2  
 13 or Eclipse filters, or evidence regarding information Bard provided to the FDA in  
 14 connection with the 510(k) process. Docs. 10323 at 2-3 (Booker), 11011 at 4-5 (Jones). The  
 15 Court found that the evidence was relevant to the negligent design and punitive damages  
 16 claims under Georgia law. *Id.* The Court determined at trial that it had no basis to conclude  
 17 that the FDA's lack of enforcement was intended by the FDA as an assertion, and therefore  
 18 declined to exclude the evidence as hearsay. Doc. 10568 at 87.

#### 19 **b. FDA Warning Letter.**

20 Defendants moved to exclude evidence of the July 13, 2015 FDA warning letter  
 21 issued to Bard. Doc. 9864 at 2-3. The Court granted the motion in part, excluding as  
 22 irrelevant topics 1, 2, 4(a), 4(b), 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the warning letter. Docs. 10258 at 6-8  
 23 (Booker), 10805 at 1 (Jones), 12736 (Hyde), 17401 at 10 (Tinlin). Topics 1 and 2 concern  
 24 the Recovery Cone retrieval system; Topic 4(a) concerns the filter cleaning process; and  
 25 Topics 4(b), 5, 6, 7, and 8 concern the Denali Filter. The Court concluded that none of these  
 26 topics was relevant to the issues in the bellwether cases involving a G2 filter (Booker), an

---

27 <sup>5</sup> The Court did not find a limiting instruction necessary at the close of either the  
 28 Booker or Jones trials. *See* Doc. 10694 at 9.

1 Eclipse filter (Jones), either a G2X or Eclipse filter (Hyde), and a Recovery filter (Tinlin).  
 2 *Id.*

3 The Court deferred ruling on the relevance of topic 3 until trial in all bellwether  
 4 cases. The Court found that topic 3, concerning Bard's complaint handling and reporting of  
 5 adverse events with respect to the G2 and Eclipse filters, as well as the adequacy of Bard's  
 6 evaluation of the root cause of the violations, was relevant to rebut the implication at trial  
 7 that the FDA took no action with respect to Bard IVC filters. *See* Doc. 10693 at 13-15; Doc.  
 8 11256. The Court concluded that the warning letter was admissible under Federal Rule of  
 9 Evidence 803(8), and was not barred as hearsay. Doc. 10258 at 7. The Court further  
 10 concluded that the probative value of topic 3 was not substantially outweighed by the danger  
 11 of unfair prejudice to Bard under Rule 403. *Id.* The Court admitted the warning letter in  
 12 redacted form during the three bellwether trials. *See* Docs. 10565, 11256, 12736. The Court  
 13 noted that topic 3 included reference to the G2, the filter at issue in Booker, and reached  
 14 similar conclusions in Jones and Hyde. Doc. 17401 at 11. The parties disputed the relevance  
 15 of topic 3 in Tinlin because it did not include reference to the Recovery, the filter at issue  
 16 in Tinlin. *Id.* The Court did not decide this issue because the Tinlin case settled.

17 **c. Recovery Cephalad Migration Death Evidence.**

18 Defendants moved to exclude evidence of cephalad migration (i.e., migration of the  
 19 filter toward the patient's heart) by a Recovery filter resulting in patient death. The Court  
 20 denied the motion for the Booker bellwether trial, which involved a G2 filter. Docs. 10258  
 21 at 4-5, 10323 at 4.

22 The Court granted the motion for the Jones bellwether trial, which involved an  
 23 Eclipse filter, and denied Plaintiff's requests for reconsideration of the ruling before and  
 24 during the trial. *See* Docs. 10819, 10920, 11041, 11113, 11256, 11302; *see also* Doc. 11409  
 25 at 94-96. As noted, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the Court's rulings. *See In re Bard IVC Filters*  
 26 *Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 816 F. App'x 218, 219 (9th Cir. 2020). The Ninth Circuit denied  
 27 Plaintiff's petition for rehearing en banc. *See* No. 18-16461, Doc. 54.

28 The Court granted the motion for the Hyde bellwether trial, which involved either a

1 G2X or Eclipse filter. Doc. 12533 at 6-7. Plaintiff Hyde has appealed this ruling. Docs.  
2 13465, 13480.

3 The Court denied Defendants' motion for the Tinlin bellwether trial, which involved  
4 a Recovery filter. Doc. 17401 at 7-10. The Tinlin case settled before trial.

5 The Court concluded for purposes of the Booker bellwether trial that evidence of  
6 cephalad migrations by a Recovery filter resulting in patient death was necessary for the  
7 jury to understand the issues that prompted creation and design of the next-generation G2  
8 filter, and thus was relevant to Plaintiff's design defect claims. Doc. 10323 at 4. In addition,  
9 because the Recovery filter was the predicate device for the G2 filter in Defendants' 510(k)  
10 submission to the FDA, and Defendants asserted to the FDA that the G2 was as safe and  
11 effective as the Recovery, the Court concluded that the safety and effectiveness of the  
12 Recovery filter was at issue. *Id.* The Court was concerned, however, that too heavy an  
13 emphasis on deaths caused by cephalad migration of the Recovery filter – a kind of  
14 migration which did not occur in the G2 filter generally or the Booker case specifically –  
15 would result in unfair prejudice to Defendants that substantially outweighed the probative  
16 value of the evidence. *Id.* Defendants did not object during trial that Plaintiffs were over-  
17 emphasizing the death evidence.

18 The Court initially concluded for purposes of the Jones bellwether trial, which  
19 involved an Eclipse filter, that evidence of cephalad migration deaths by the Recovery filter  
20 was inadmissible because it was only marginally relevant to Plaintiff's claims and its  
21 marginal relevancy was substantially outweighed by the risk of unfair prejudice. *See* Docs.  
22 10819, 10920, 11041, 11113, 11256, 11302. This is because cephalad migration did not  
23 continue in any significant degree beyond the Recovery filter; cephalad migration deaths  
24 all occurred before the Recovery was taken off the market in late 2005; Ms. Jones did not  
25 receive her Eclipse filter until 2010; the Recovery-related deaths said nothing about three  
26 of Ms. Jones' four claims (strict liability design defect and the failure to warn claims); and  
27 instances of cephalad migration deaths were not substantially similar to complications  
28 experienced by Ms. Jones and therefore did not meet the Georgia standard for evidence on

1 punitive damages. Docs. 10819, 11041.

2 The Court also found that deaths caused by a non-predicate device (the Recovery  
3 was not the predicate device for the Eclipse in Defendants' 510(k) submission), and by a  
4 form of migration that was eliminated years earlier, were of sufficiently limited probative  
5 value that their relevancy was substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice  
6 because the death evidence may prompt a jury decision based on emotion. *Id.* The Court  
7 further concluded that Plaintiff Jones would not be seriously hampered in her ability to  
8 prove Recovery filter complications, testing, and design when references to cephalad  
9 migration deaths are removed. Doc. 11041. As a result, the Court held that such references  
10 should be redacted from evidence presented during the Jones trial.

11 The Court balanced this concern with the competing concern that it would be unfair  
12 for Defendants to present statistics about the Recovery filter and not allow Plaintiffs to  
13 present competing evidence that included Recovery deaths. *See, e.g.*, Doc. 11391 at 12.  
14 Based on this concern, Plaintiffs argued at various points during the trial that Defendants  
15 had opened the door to presenting evidence about Recovery cephalad migration deaths. The  
16 Court repeatedly made fact-specific determinations on this point, holding that even though  
17 Defendants presented some evidence that made the Recovery evidence more relevant, the  
18 danger of unfair prejudice continued to substantially outweigh the probative value of the  
19 cephalad migration death evidence. *See* Docs. 11113, 11302; *see also* Doc. 11409 at 94-96.

20 The Court concluded for purposes of the Hyde bellwether trial, which involved either  
21 a G2X or Eclipse filter, that evidence of Recovery filter cephalad migration deaths should  
22 be excluded under Rule 403 for the reasons identified in the Jones bellwether trial. Doc.  
23 12533 at 6-7. The Court concluded that this evidence had marginal relevance to Plaintiff's  
24 claims because Ms. Hyde received either a G2X or Eclipse filter, two or three generations  
25 after the Recovery filter; Ms. Hyde did not receive her filter until 2011, more than five years  
26 after cephalad migration deaths stopped when the Recovery was taken off the market; the  
27 deaths did not show that G2X or Eclipse filters – which did not cause cephalad migration  
28 deaths – had design defects when they left Defendants' control; nor did the cephalad



1 migration deaths, which were eliminated by design changes in the G2, shed light on  
2 Defendants' state of mind when designing and marketing the G2X and Eclipse filters. *Id.* at  
3 7.

4 The Court concluded for purposes of the Tinlin bellwether trial, which involved a  
5 Recovery filter, that Recovery deaths and Defendants' knowledge of those deaths were  
6 relevant to Plaintiffs' design defect claim under Wisconsin law because they went directly  
7 to the Recovery's foreseeable risks of harm and whether it was unreasonably dangerous.  
8 Doc. 17401 at 7-8. The Court also concluded that the Recovery death evidence was relevant  
9 to Plaintiffs' failure to warn and concealment claims because it was probative on the  
10 causation issue – that is, whether her treating physician would have selected a different filter  
11 for Ms. Tinlin had he been warned about the Recovery's true risks, as Plaintiffs describe  
12 them. *Id.* at 8. In addition, because this evidence would be used to impeach expert testimony  
13 from Defendants that the Recovery filter was safe and effective, the Court concluded that  
14 substantial similarity was not required. *Id.* at 8-9. The Court further concluded that the death  
15 evidence was relevant to Bard's state of mind and to show the reprehensibility of its alleged  
16 conduct for purposes of punitive damages. *Id.* at 9-10. The Court reached a different  
17 conclusion in the Jones and Hyde cases because cephalad migration deaths stopped when  
18 the Recovery was taken off the market in 2005, and the deaths shed little light on  
19 Defendants' state of mind when marketing different, improved filters years later. *Id.* at 9  
20 n.4. As noted, the Tinlin case settled before trial.

21 **d. SNF Evidence.**

22 Plaintiffs sought to exclude evidence of complications associated with the SNF,  
23 claiming that they were barred from conducting relevant discovery into the design and  
24 testing of the SNF under CMO 10. Doc. 10487; *see* Doc. 1319. The Court denied Plaintiffs'  
25 request. Doc. 10489. The Court did not agree that Plaintiffs were foreclosed from obtaining  
26 relevant evidence for rebuttal. The Court foreclosed this discovery because Plaintiffs did  
27 not contend that the SNF was defective. *Id.* at 2. Plaintiffs also had rebuttal evidence  
28 showing that reported failure rates for SNF were lower than Recovery and G2 failure rates.

1 *Id.* The Court ultimately concluded it would not preclude Defendants from presenting its  
 2 SNF evidence on the basis of a discovery ruling and permitted Plaintiffs to make appropriate  
 3 evidentiary objections at trial. *Id.* at 3.

4 **e. Use of Testimony of Withdrawn Experts.**

5 Defendants sought to preclude Plaintiffs' use at trial of the depositions of three  
 6 defense experts – Drs. Moritz, Rogers, and Stein – who originally were retained by Bard  
 7 but were later withdrawn in some or all cases. Doc. 10255 at 2. The Court denied the request  
 8 in part. Doc. 10382. The Court found that Defendants failed to show that the depositions of  
 9 these experts were inadmissible on hearsay grounds, but agreed that it would be unfairly  
 10 prejudicial under Rule 403 to disclose to the jury that the experts originally were retained  
 11 by Bard. *Id.* at 2-3. The Court therefore concluded that Plaintiffs could use portions of the  
 12 experts' depositions that support Plaintiffs' claims, but could not disclose to the jury that  
 13 the experts originally were retained by Bard. *Id.* at 3. The Court was concerned about the  
 14 presentation of cumulative evidence, and therefore required Plaintiffs to show that no other  
 15 expert of similar qualifications was available or that the unavailable expert had some unique  
 16 testimony to contribute, before the deposition of any withdrawn expert could be used at  
 17 trial. *Id.* at 3-4.

18 **f. Other Motion in Limine Rulings.**

19 Other motion in limine ("MIL") rulings may be useful to the receiving courts. See  
 20 Docs. 10075, 10235, 10258, 10947. The courts are referred to the following motions and  
 21 orders to assist in preparing for trial:<sup>6</sup>

- 22
- 23 • **Parties' Joint Stipulation on MILs in Booker:** The Court, on stipulation of the  
 24 parties, excluded evidence concerning several case-specific issues in the Booker  
 bellwether trial, as well as a few general issues, including: Bard's 1994 criminal  
 conviction; other lawsuits or claims against Bard; advertising by Plaintiff's

---

25

26 <sup>6</sup> The Court also ruled on the parties' MILs concerning several case-specific issues.  
 27 See Docs. 10075 (Plaintiff's MIL 12 in Booker), 10258 (Plaintiff's MILs 6 and 13 in  
 28 Booker), 10947 (Defendants' MIL 1 and Plaintiff's MILs 1-4 and 7 in Jones), 12533  
 (Plaintiff's MIL 3 in Hyde), 17285 (Plaintiff's MIL 1 in Tinlin), 17401 (Plaintiff's MILs 2,  
 3, and 6 in Tinlin).

counsel; Plaintiff's counsel specializing in personal injury or products liability litigation; contingency fee agreements; and advertising by any counsel nationally for IVC filter cases. Doc. 10235.

- **Defendants MIL 1 in Booker:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony concerning Recovery complications. Doc. 10258 at 1-5; *see* Doc. 10819 (Jones). As noted above, the Court permitted evidence and testimony concerning Recovery filter cephalad migration deaths in the Booker bellwether trial involving a G2 filter (Doc. 10323 at 4), but excluded such evidence in the trials involving a G2X or Eclipse filter (Docs. 10819, 10920, 11041).
- **Defendants' MIL 2 in Booker:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony relating to the development of the Recovery filter. Doc. 10258 at 5-6; *see* Doc. 10819 at 2-3 (Jones).
- **Defendants' MIL 4 in Booker:** The Court excluded evidence and testimony concerning a photograph of Bard employee Michael Randall making an offensive gesture. Doc. 10075 at 1-2.
- **Defendants' MIL 5 in Booker:** The Court permitted Plaintiff's expert Dr. Thomas Kinney to be called as a fact witness, but prohibited him from testifying regarding his prior work for Bard as an expert witness in two prior IVC filter cases or as a paid consultant to Bard. Docs. 10075 at 2-3, 10323 at 4.
- **Plaintiff's MIL 2 in Booker:** The Court reserved ruling until trial on evidence and testimony regarding the nature of Bard's business, including the nature, quality, and usefulness of its products, the conscientiousness of its employees, and references to its mission statement. Doc. 10075 at 3-4.
- **Plaintiff's MIL 3 in Booker:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony concerning the benefits of IVC filters, including testimony describing Bard filters as "lifesaving" devices. Doc. 10258 at 8.
- **Plaintiff's MIL 4 in Booker:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony that IVC filters, including Bard's filters, are within the standard of care for the medical treatment of pulmonary embolism. Doc. 10258 at 8-9. Defendants agreed to not characterize IVC filters as the "gold standard" for the treatment of pulmonary embolisms. *Id.* at 8.
- **Plaintiff's MIL 5 in Booker:** The Court denied as moot the motion to exclude evidence and argument relating to failure rates, complication rates, percentages, or comparative analysis of any injuries that were not produced to Plaintiffs during discovery, as all such information was produced. Doc. 10075 at 4.
- **Plaintiff's MIL 7 in Booker:** The Court excluded evidence and argument relating to prior judicial opinions about Plaintiffs' experts, including the number of times their testimony has been precluded in other cases. *Id.*
- **Plaintiff's MIL 8 in Booker:** The Court excluded evidence and argument that a verdict against Defendants will have an adverse impact on the medical community, future medical device research or costs, and the availability of medical care. *Id.* at 4-5.
- **Plaintiff's MIL 9 in Booker:** The Court deferred ruling on the relevance of statements or lack of statements from medical societies, including the Society of

Interventional Radiologists (“SIR”), until trial. Doc. 10258 at 14-18. The Court ultimately admitted this evidence in both the Booker and Jones bellwether trials.

- **Plaintiff’s MIL 10 in Booker:** The Court excluded evidence and testimony that Bard needed FDA consent to add warnings to its labels, send warning letters to physicians and patients, or recall its filters. *Id.* at 18-19. The Court permitted evidence and argument explaining the reasons why Bard filters were not recalled, FDA’s potential involvement in any recall effort, and the fact that warnings about failure rates and increased risks could not be based on MDR and MAUDE data alone. *Id.*
- **Plaintiff’s MIL 11 in Booker:** The Court permitted evidence and argument relating to the informed consent form signed by Plaintiff prior to insertion of the IVC filter, even though the form is not specific to IVC filters or Bard filters. Doc. 10075 at 5-6.
- **Plaintiff’s MIL 14 in Booker:** The Court reserved ruling until trial on evidence and argument relating to background information and personal traits of Bard employees and witnesses. *Id.* at 7.
- **Plaintiff’s MIL 6 in Jones:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony concerning whether a party’s expert had been retained by the same attorneys in other litigation. Doc. 10947 at 8-9.
- **Plaintiff’s MIL 5 in Jones:** The Court excluded evidence and testimony that Bard employees or their relatives have received Bard IVC filter implants. *Id.* at 9-10.
- **Defendants’ MIL 2 in Jones:** The Court excluded evidence and testimony of other lawsuits against Bard. *Id.* at 11.
- **Plaintiff’s MILs 4 and 5 in Hyde:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony concerning Bard’s Instructions for Use (“IFU”) and SIR Guidelines. Doc. 12507.
- **Plaintiff’s MIL 2 in Hyde:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony concerning “The Surgeon General’s Call to Action to Prevent Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism.” Doc. 12533 at 4-6.
- **Defendants’ MIL 3 in Hyde:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony that Bard’s SNF is a reasonable alternative design. *Id.* at 7.
- **Defendants’ MIL 4 in Hyde:** The Court excluded testimony from Dr. Muehrcke about his personal feelings of betrayal and his moral and ethical issues with Bard’s conduct. *Id.* at 7-8.
- **Defendants’ MIL 6 in Hyde:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony regarding informed consent. *Id.* at 8-9.
- **Plaintiff’s MIL 4 in Tinlin:** The Court reserved ruling until trial on evidence and argument relating to a chart created by Defendants from their internal TrackWise database regarding reporting rates of IVC filter complications. Doc. 17401 at 5.

- **Plaintiff's MIL 5 in Tinlin:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony concerning a chart comparing the sales of the permanent SNF with those of retrievable filters between 2002 and 2016. *Id.* at 5-6.
- **Defendants' MIL 3 in Tinlin:** The Court permitted evidence and testimony concerning the Recovery Filter Crisis Communications Plan that Bard had prepared in 2004 to help manage damaging media coverage about a Recovery migration death. *Id.* at 11-12.
- **Defendants' MIL 4 in Tinlin:** The Court excluded evidence and testimony concerning Dr. Muehrcke's untimely disclosed opinion that one of his patients died from cardiac tamponade caused by a fractured strut that had embolized to her heart. *Id.* at 12-13.

#### 6. Deposition Designation Rulings.

The Court has ruled on numerous objections to deposition designations for trial and refers the transferor courts to the following orders:<sup>7</sup>

Deponent	Depo. Date	Doc. No(s).
Bill Altonaga	10/22/2013	10497, 10922, 12598
Murray Asch	05/02/2016	12508
Brian Barry	01/31/2014	17513
Christine Brauer	05/23/2014 08/02/2017	10922, 10922, 12590
David Ciavarella	11/12/2013	10403, 12508, 12590
Gary Cohen	01/25/2017	10438
Robert Cortelezzi	11/11/2016	10438, 11064, 12590
Len DeCant	05/24/2016	10438, 11080, 12590
John DeFord	06/02/2016	10524, 11080, 12595
Joseph DeJohn	06/17/2016	12357
Mary Edwards	01/20/2014	10438, 12598
Thomas Ferari	10/20/2010	12357, 17386

---

<sup>7</sup> In addition to the depositions identified in the table above, the Court ruled on numerous objections to case-specific deposition designations for trial.

<b>Deponent</b>	<b>Depo. Date</b>	<b>Doc. No(s).</b>
Matthew Fermanich	03/27/2017	12508
Robert Ferrara	04/17/2017	10438, 12590
Timothy Fischer	03/29/2017	17513
Chris Ganser	10/11/2016	10438, 11073, 12595
Brooke Gillette	07/11/2014	17386
Holly Glass	09/23/2016	17513
Jason Greer	08/11/2014	10438, 10922, 12590
Janet Hudnall	11/01/2013	10403, 12598
Brian Hudson	01/17/2014	10403, 12590
Sanjeeva Kalva	07/11/2017	17582
Krishna Kandarpa	07/19/2018	12590
William Kuo	03/23/2017	12357
John Lehmann	08/07/2014	10922, 12357
William Little	07/27/2016	10438, 11064, 12598
Hugh Magee	10/17/2017	17513
John McDermott	02/05/2014	10438, 12590
Patrick McDonald	07/29/2016	10486, 11064, 12590
Mark Moritz	07/18/2017	10922, 12590
Daniel Orms	08/16/2016	10403, 11073, 12595
Abithal Raji-Kubba	07/18/2016	11064
Gin Schulz	01/30/2014	10403, 12598
Christopher Smith	08/03/2017	11073
William Stavropoulos	02/01/2017	10524
Jack Sullivan	11/03/2016 09/16/2016	10486, 11080, 12590 11080, 12590
Melanie Sussman	04/07/2017	11073

Deponent	Depo. Date	Doc. No(s).
Mehdi Syed	03/02/2018	11313
Scott Trerotola	01/20/2017	10524, 12590
Douglas Uelmen	10/04/2013	10403, 11080, 12590
Carol Vierling	05/11/2016	10486, 11073
Allison Walsh	01/23/2014	17386
Mark Wilson	01/31/2017	10922
Natalie Wong	10/18/2016	10403, 12590
John Worland	03/16/2011	17582

### 7. Subject Matter Jurisdiction Ruling.

The parties identified cases in the MDL for which federal subject matter jurisdiction does not exist. Docs. 20210, 21410, 21552. No federal question jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the master complaint asserts no federal claim and the state law claims alleged in the complaint do not depend on the resolution of a federal law question. Doc. 364 ¶¶ 166-349. For purposes of diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, Defendant C. R. Bard, Inc. is a citizen of New Jersey and Defendant Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. is a citizen of Arizona. *See id.* ¶¶ 11-12. Thus, complete diversity between the parties does not exist in any case where each Defendant is a named party and Plaintiff is a resident of either Arizona or New Jersey. *See* Doc. 20210-1.

Plaintiffs in most of the cases without subject matter jurisdiction agreed to a dismissal without prejudice. *See id.* Plaintiffs in other cases opposed dismissal, but provided no reason why the cases should not be dismissed. *See id.* The Court dismissed without prejudice multiple cases for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *See* Docs. 20667, 21461, 21579. Some of these cases may be refiled in state court. *See* Doc. 20210-1.

///

///

///



**I. Further Proceedings in Transferred Cases.**

**1. General Discovery.**

Because all general fact and expert discovery has been completed in this MDL, the courts receiving these cases need not be concerned with facilitating general expert, corporate, and third-party discovery. This observation is not meant to restrict the power of transferee courts for good cause or in the interest of justice to address issues that may be unique and relevant in a transferred case.

**2. Case-Specific Discovery and Trial Preparation.**

According to the parties, the status of the remaining discovery and other pretrial issues for the cases being transferred, and the estimated time needed to resolve such issues and make the cases ready for trial, will be determined after transfer. Final trial preparation in the bellwether trials was governed by certain Court orders. *See* Docs. 8871, 10323, 10587, 11011, 11320, 11321, 11659, 11871, 12061, 12853, 12971.

**J. Documents to Be Sent to Transferee Courts.**

The Court has concluded that the cases listed on Schedule A should be transferred to appropriate districts pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Upon receipt of this transfer order, the Clerk for this District shall issue a letter to the transferee courts, via email, setting out the process for transferring the case. The letter and certified copy of this transfer order will be sent to the transferee courts' email addresses.

The parties have submitted a stipulated designation of record for transferred cases. *See* Doc. 19444-1. Upon receipt of this transfer order, the Clerk of this District shall transmit to the transferee court the following: (1) a copy of the individual docket sheet for the transferred action, (2) a copy of the master docket sheet in this MDL, and (3) the record designated by the parties.

If a party believes that the docket sheet for a particular case being transferred is not correct, a party to that case may, with notice to all other parties in the case, file with the transferee court a designation amending the record. Upon receiving such designation, the transferee court may make any needed changes to the docket. If the docket is revised to

1 include additional documents, the parties should provide those documents to the transferee  
2 court.

3 **III. Conclusion.**

4 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), the Clerk of this District is directed to transfer the  
5 cases listed on Schedule A to appropriate districts for further proceedings.

6 The Clerk of this District is directed to unconsolidate one case from the MDL: *Tami*  
7 *Sheets v. C. R. Bard, Inc.*, No. 2:16-cv-01088. This case will remain in the District of  
8 Arizona and be assigned to the undersigned judge.

9  
10 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 13th day of November, 2020.

11 BEUS GILBERT MCGRODER PLLC

NELSON MULLINS RILEY &  
SCARBOROUGH, LLP

12  
13 By: /s/ Mark O'Connor (with permission)

By: /s/ Richard B. North, Jr.

14 Mark S. O'Connor (011029)  
15 701 North 44<sup>th</sup> St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85008

Richard B. North, Jr. (*pro hac vice*)  
Georgia Bar No. 545599  
Matthew B. Lerner (*pro hac vice*)  
Georgia Bar No. 446986  
Atlantic Station  
201 17th Street, NW / Suite 1700  
Atlanta, GA 30363

16 Ramon Rossi Lopez  
17 (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
CA Bar No. 86361  
LOPEZ MCHUGH LLP  
100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5600  
Newport Beach, CA 92660

James R. Condo (005867)  
Kristine L. Gallardo (033975)  
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.  
One Arizona Center  
400 E. Van Buren  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2204

18  
19 *Co-Lead/Liaison Counsel for*  
20 *Plaintiffs*

*Attorneys for C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard*  
*Peripheral Vascular, Inc.*